

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

<b>RAYMOND GREGORY VERRET</b>	§	<b>PLAINTIFF</b>
	§	
	§	
<b>v.</b>	§	<b>Civil No. 1:21cv93-HSO-MTP</b>
	§	
	§	
<b>COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY</b>	§	<b>DEFENDANT</b>
	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S REPORT  
AND RECOMMENDATION [18], AFFIRMING COMMISSIONER  
OF SOCIAL SECURITY’S DECISION, AND DISMISSING  
CIVIL ACTION WITH PREJUDICE**

BEFORE THE COURT is the Report and Recommendation [18] of United States Magistrate Judge Michael T. Parker entered on July 19, 2022. The Magistrate Judge recommended that the Commissioner of Social Security’s decision be affirmed and that this case be dismissed with prejudice. *See* R. & R. [18] at 14 (filed restricted access). No party has objected to the Report and Recommendation [18], and the time for doing so has passed. After review of the record and relevant law, the Court finds that the Report and Recommendation [18] should be adopted, that the Commissioner’s decision should be affirmed, and that this civil action should be dismissed with prejudice.

## I. BACKGROUND

On or about February 5, 2019, Plaintiff Raymond Gregory Verret (“Plaintiff” or “Verret”) filed an application with the Social Security Administration for disability insurance benefits, alleging an onset of disability on February 1, 2014. *See* R. [11] at 143 (filed restricted access). The claim was initially denied in April 2019, *see id.* at 90-93, and upon reconsideration, *see id.* at 96-105, 109. After Plaintiff submitted a written request for hearing, *see id.* at 114, an Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) held a telephonic hearing, *see id.* at 143. The ALJ considered whether the claimant was disabled under the Social Security Act (the “Act”) and whether Plaintiff satisfied the “insured status requirements” under the Act. *See id.* at 14-15. The ALJ concluded that Plaintiff was not disabled. *See id.* at 26. Plaintiff sought Appeals Council review of the ALJ’s decision, *see id.* at 243, which was denied, *see id.* at 4.

Plaintiff filed a Complaint [1] in this Court seeking judicial review pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). *See* Compl. [1] (filed restricted access). Plaintiff insists that he “was disabled and unable to work during the time period included in this case” and “continues to be disabled and unable to work,” such that he is entitled to disability benefits. *Id.* at 2.

On July 19, 2022, United States Magistrate Judge Michael T. Parker entered a Report and Recommendation [18] finding that “the Commissioner’s decision is supported by substantial evidence and that no reversible error of law was committed by the ALJ.” R. & R. [18] at 14 (filed restricted access). The Magistrate Judge

concluded that the Commissioner's decision should be affirmed and that this action should be dismissed with prejudice. *See id.* No party has objected to the Report and Recommendation [18], and the time for doing so has passed. *See* L.U. Civ. R. 72(a)(1)(A).

## II. DISCUSSION

Where no party has objected to a Magistrate Judge's report and recommendation, the Court need not conduct a de novo review of it. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) ("A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made."). Where there are no objections, the Court applies the "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law" standard of review to the report and recommendation. *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989).

Having conducted the required review, the Court concludes that the Report and Recommendation [18] is neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. The Court will adopt the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation [18] as the opinion of this Court and affirm the decision of the Commissioner.

## III. CONCLUSION

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that, United States Magistrate Judge Michael T. Parker's Report and Recommendation [18], entered on July 19, 2022, is **ADOPTED** as the finding of this Court.

**IT IS, FURTHER, ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that, the Commissioner of Social Security's decision is **AFFIRMED**, and this civil action is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**. This Court will enter a separate final judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58.

**SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED**, this the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of August, 2022.

*s/ Halil Suleyman Ozerden*

HALIL SULEYMAN OZERDEN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE